

-15-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on April 24, 2007, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration. Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-18 and 22-37 are now pending in this Application. Claim(s) 1, 15 and 29-31 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claim(s) 4-6, 8, 10, 12-15, 24 and 26-37 have been amended and claim(s) 17 has been canceled. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Drawings:

The Office Action persists in a rejection of the drawings. Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to Applicants response to the previous office action, pages 2-4, wherein applicant amends the specification to include the deficient figure references. Applicant believes these previous amendments to clarify the unclear references in the drawings.

Objections:

The Office Action indicates informalities in the claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his observations. The indicated informalities have been corrected as per the specification amendments above. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101:

The Office Action rejects independent claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants have herein amended claims 30 and 31 to recite a computer readable storage medium. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 has been overcome as it is requested that it be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Hefetz, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0123238

Claim 1, 2, 4-18 and 22-37 were rejected under **35 U.S.C. §102(e)** as being anticipated by Hefetz, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0123238. Applicant(s)

respectfully disagree(s) with these contentions and assert that the present claimed invention is not anticipated by any disclosure in the Hefetz references.

Prior to discussing Applicant's substantive amendments, applicant would like to interject some background. One of the problems addressed by the present claims is a system for mitigating duplicative code often produced with graphical web pages, typically HTML, commonly associated with GUI output. Often, page "framing" and other graphically repetitive content are duplicated across multiple HTML files. The present claims introduce a page template including the repetitive static content, which includes tokens pointing to the changing dynamic content. The tokens are substituted with different dynamic content of the actual display data depending on the context in which they are invoked. Multiple output pages including different dynamic content are generated from the same template, thus reducing duplicative static content across multiple HTML files. Hefetz '238, in contrast, teaches a development test aid implemented as a "switch" that toggles between active "live" content and static placeholders for testing purposes, as the discussion below makes clear.

The Office Action persists in the rejections based on Hefetz, with particular reference to amended Claim 1, suggesting that the metalanguage representations in applicant's previous amendment are not sufficiently distinguished from the Hefetz system. By way of further clarification, the claimed metalanguage representations refer to the metadata components, referenced by parsed tokens in the page templates, discussed at page 6, lines 16-20. The metadata components include page descriptors, which in the example configuration are depicted as XML fragments including the dynamic content.

Therefore, the metalanguage representations are, in the example configuration, page descriptors. The page descriptors are represented by tokens parseable from the page template (page 11, lines 8-31). Thus, the parsed tokens point to a page descriptor which includes the dynamic content, i.e. display data and output data, already recited in claims 15 and 29.

Claim 1 has been amended to define the metalanguage representations as page descriptors pointing to the active content on the rendered output page, as disclosed at page 5, line 26-page 6, line 5 and at page 11, lines 12-22.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been herein amended to recite that building further comprising rendering an output page by: fetching, based on the parsed token, a page descriptor corresponding to the parsed token, the page descriptor defining the metalanguage representation; and retrieving the dynamic content from the fetched page descriptor.

In further contrast, Hefetz merely provides selection or suppression of active content, not metadata representations (page descriptors) that point to renderable active content from static template. Thus, the present claims further differ because the same static content may refer to multiple page descriptors corresponding to multiple rendered output pages in a 1:N relationship, thus exhibiting a hierarchical structure (page 15, lines 15-27). The Hefetz approach merely teaches a 1:1 correspondence of active or static content depending on whether active content is switched on. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the page template [is] indicative of a plurality of output reports, to more clearly indicate the hierarchical nature of the output templates and corresponding output pages. Claims 15 and 29-31 have been likewise amended.

Hefetz does not show, teach, or disclose the claimed rendering an output page by: fetching, based on the parsed token, a page descriptor corresponding to the parsed token, the page descriptor defining the metalanguage representation; and retrieving the dynamic content from the fetched page descriptor, nor that that the page template[s are] indicative of a plurality of output reports. In contrast, Hefetz '238 discloses a design approach that allows placeholders to switch between a representative display container that withholds runtime content, and the actual runtime content itself, as discussed at paragraphs 0039 and 41. Thus, Hefetz shows a system that bypasses actual dynamic content to facilitate a design effort, and then "switching on" the dynamic content at run time. In contrast, the present system employs a metadata

-18-

representation including page descriptors that identify the format and position of dynamic content. In contrast to Hefetz, the present system does not require bypassing or placeholdering of runtime data for WYSIWIG screen editing purposes. Rather, the present system teaches metadata representation of dynamic content that differs from the Hefetz approach because no selection of runtime vs. compile time entities is performed or required, in contrast to tag library selection by Hefetz at paragraph 0050. Thus, Hefetz provides a design editing tool, not a dynamic content metadata processing method.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 15 and 29-31, which by the foregoing are deemed allowable, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-19-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: SUN03-12(040036)

Dated: July 24, 2007